

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
EUGENE DIVISION

STEVEN C. MOOREHEAD,  
Plaintiff,

Case No. 6:17-cv-00917-MK  
**ORDER**

vs.

DEPARTMENT OF THE  
INTERIOR, et al,  
Defendants.

---

AIKEN, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge Mustafa Kasubhai filed his Findings and Recommendations (“F&R”) (doc. 60) recommending that defendant’s Motion for Summary Judgment (doc. 38) should be GRANTED. This case is now before me. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).

When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate judge’s F&R, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the magistrate

judge's report. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), *cert denied*, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). Plaintiff has filed timely objections. (doc. 64) Thus, I review the F&R *de novo*.

Having considered the record and the arguments offered by plaintiff, the Court finds no error in Magistrate Judge Kasubhai's analysis. Therefore, the Court adopts the F&R (doc. 60) in its entirety. Thus, defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (doc. 38) is GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 27th day of May, 2020.

/s/Ann Aiken

---

Ann Aiken  
United States District Judge